

Remarks/Arguments

Responsive to the restriction requirement, applicants provisionally elect the Species I of Figs. 1-3. Claims 1-3, 6-15 and 18-20 read on the elected species.

Reconsideration of the restriction requirement is respectfully requested for the following reasons. Firstly, as between the species of Figs. 1-3 and the species of Fig. 5 as noted in the figure description on lines 4 and 5 of page 8 of the application, "Figure 5 shows a sealing arrangement for the same high pressure application using the seal of Figure 1." Also, the instant application on page 9 at lines 13-15 refers to Figure 5 as showing "multiple units of the invention".

Secondly, as between the species of Figs. 1-3 and the species of Fig. 6, the application indicates on page 10 at lines 1-4 that the principles of operation for the embodiment of Figure 6 are the same as those for the embodiment of Figure 5. As pointed out above, Figure 5 shows an arrangement using the seal of Figure 1. Furthermore, the second paragraph on page 10, beginning with "In keeping with the spirit of the invention" ties in the species of Figure 6 with the species of Figures 1-3.


Figure 4 shows a prior art arrangement and therefore should be removed from consideration with respect to the restriction requirement. Claim 13 has been amended to be dependent upon claim 1 to expedite consideration of this request for consideration of the restriction requirement

Favorable action on this application is respectfully  
requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Hodgson Russ LLP

By



Martin G. Linihan, Reg. No. 24,926

One M&T Plaza, Suite 2000  
Buffalo, New York 14203-2391  
Tel: (716) 848-1367  
DATE: July 11, 2005